



County of San Diego

DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

BRIAN ALBRIGHT
DIRECTOR

www.sdparks.org

Administrative Office: (858) 694-3030
Fax: (858) 495-5841
Reservations: (858) 565-3600

September 14, 2011

CEQA Initial Study - Environmental Checklist Form (Based on the State CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G Rev. January, 2011)

1. Project Title:

Lawrence and Barbara Daley Preserve Habitat Restoration Project

2. Lead agency name and address:

County of San Diego, Department of Parks and Recreation
5500 Overland Avenue, Suite 410
San Diego, CA 92123

3. a. Contact: Jessica Norton, Project Manager
b. Phone number: (858) 966-1379
c. E-mail: jessica.norton@sdcounty.ca.gov

4. Project location:

The proposed project is located within Lawrence and Barbara Daley Preserve, north and east of Highway 94 and south of Honey Springs Road (Assessor's Parcel Numbers 600-090-27; 600-150-07; 600-150-08; and 600-160-17).

Thomas Brothers Coordinates: Page 1293, Grid G/3

5. Project Sponsor name and address:

County of San Diego, Department of Parks and Recreation
5500 Overland Avenue, Suite 410
San Diego, CA 92123

6. General Plan Designation

Community Plan: Jamul/Dulzura
Land Use Designation: Open Space (Conservation)

7. Zoning

Use Regulation: A72, General Agriculture
Special Area Regulation: Agriculture Preserve

8. Description of project:

The proposed Lawrence and Barbara Daley Preserve Habitat Restoration Project (project) consists of enhancement of 55 acres of habitat along Dulzura Creek and the implementation of and the Riparian Restoration Plan for the Lawrence and Barbara Daley Preserve Habitat Restoration Project (River Partners 2011) within the County of San Diego's Lawrence and Barbara Daley Preserve (Preserve). The primary objective of the habitat restoration is the removal of non-native invasive species and re-vegetation of native species. Restoration of native vegetation to riparian and coastal sage scrub habitat will target the desired structure of the California gnatcatcher (*Poliophtila californica*), yellow-breasted chat (*Icteria virens*), and other neo-tropical birds, as well as greatly expand the available habitat and resources for multiple other wildlife species.

The project will be implemented in two phases. Phase I consists of the initial removal of invasive, non-native plants along approximately 9,000 linear feet (55 acres) of Dulzura Creek. Phase II consists of ground preparation, potential irrigation installation (depending on the planting option chosen – see below), plant propagation, field planting, and maintenance and monitoring within a 14-acre habitat restoration area over a period of 36 months.

Phase I initial invasive, non-native species control will include a combination of methods, including herbicide application, hand removal techniques, and mowing where feasible. Efforts will avoid all native species and will target prioritized non-native species including: giant reed (*Arundo donax*), castor bean (*Ricinus communis*), tamarisk (*Tamarix* spp.), and tobacco tree (*Nicotiana glauca*). Specific techniques will be applied as follows.

Giant Reed

Due to the rugged site characteristics and limited access, giant reed along Dulzura Creek will be treated with a foliar application of a systemic herbicide between mid-August to early November. A glyphosate broad-spectrum herbicide that is labeled for wetland use by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) will be applied using backpack sprayers at a 5-7% dilution. After application, the dead stalks will be left in place. Follow-up spraying will be conducted for 1-2 years after the initial application.

Tamarisk

A combination of techniques to control tamarisk will be used. When feasible, tamarisk will be cut to approximately six inches above ground level and the stumps will be immediately painted with an appropriate herbicide. Stumps will be marked with "Day-Glo" paint and locations will be flagged so they can be easily identified for follow-up treatments. All cut material will be removed from the Preserve and properly disposed off-site. If limited by access issues or terrain, trees will be girdled near their base and the cambium layer will be sprayed with herbicide. These trees will be left to die in place. Retreatments for resprouts and seedlings will be conducted within 4 months of initial treatment. Follow-up treatments and maintenance will be done every six months for two years.

Tobacco Tree

A combination of techniques to control tobacco tree will be used. When feasible, tobacco tree will be cut to approximately six inches above ground level and the stumps will be immediately painted with an appropriate herbicide. Stumps will be marked with "Day-Glo" paint and locations will be flagged so they can be easily identified for follow-up treatments. All cut material will be removed from the Preserve and properly disposed off-site. If limited by access issues or terrain, trees will be girdled near their base and the cambium layer will be sprayed with herbicide. These trees will be left to die in place. Typically, only one treatment is necessary to kill the plant. However, because a seed bed most likely exists in the project area, a yearly follow-up effort will be conducted for 2 additional years.

Castor Bean

A combination of techniques to control castor bean will be used. When feasible, castor bean will be cut to approximately six inches above ground level and the stumps will be immediately painted with a 25% dilution of glyphosate. Stumps will be marked with "Day-Glo" paint and locations will be flagged so they can be easily identified for follow-up treatments. All cut material will be removed from the Preserve and properly disposed off-site. If limited by access issues or terrain, trees will be girdled near their base and the cambium layer will be sprayed with herbicide. These trees will be left to die in place. Typically, only one treatment is necessary to kill the plant. However, repeat sprayings may be necessary on younger tough-leaved seedlings. An effort will be made to remove all mature seed pods and seeds that may have dropped on the ground under larger mature plants during the treatment.

Only herbicides approved by the EPA for use in riparian areas will be used and all County and State herbicide permitting and reporting requirements will be followed. Roundup® (glyphosate) and 2,4-D are likely to be the most commonly used herbicides on the project. Rodeo® (for areas adjacent to water bodies), and Garlon™ (for woody species control) may also be used. These herbicides are non-toxic to wildlife when used

according to label and all regulations are followed. Only target non-native plants will be treated and only licensed applicators will be used.

Phase II will implement one of two site-specific planting designs developed for the 14-acre habitat restoration area. Option A assumes the use of an existing well to install irrigation via a series of drip lines and consists of plantings of native species. This option will restore approximately 4 acres of coastal sage scrub on the north side of Dulzura Creek, and 8 acres of southern willow scrub and 2 acres of southern riparian woodland south of the creek. A summary of the overall proposed plant species for Option A is provided in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Option A (Irrigation) Summary of Overall Proposed Plant Species

Common Name	Scientific Name	Density (Plants Per Acre)	Estimated Plant Totals
Tree Species			
Fremont Cottonwood	<i>Populus fremontii</i>	18	178
Western Sycamore	<i>Platanus racemosa</i>	12	120
Coast Live Oak	<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>	33	65
Gooding's Black Willow	<i>Salix goodingii</i>	23	229
Arroyo Willow	<i>Salix lasiolepis</i>	5	42
Red Willow	<i>Salix laevigata</i>	21	215
Tree Species Total		112	849
Shrub Species			
Narrowleaf Willow	<i>Salix exigua</i>	42	338
Mule Fat	<i>Baccharis salicifolia</i>	31	253
Coyote Brush	<i>Baccharis pularis</i>	11	85
Lemonadeberry	<i>Rhus integrifolia</i>	8	30
Laurel Sumac	<i>Malosma laurina</i>	5	20
Coastal Sagebrush	<i>Artemisia californica</i>	15	60
Black Sage	<i>Salvia mellifera</i>	8	30
Blue Elderberry	<i>Sambucus mexicana</i>	21	169
California Rose	<i>Rosa californica</i>	30	299
California Blackberry	<i>Rubus ursinus</i>	19	185
Shrub Species Total		190	1,439
Herbaceous Species			
Blue Wildrye	<i>Elymus glaucus</i>	108	1079
Creeping Wildrye	<i>Leymus triticoides</i>	106	1058
Wild Cucumber	<i>Marah macrocarpus</i>	6	25
Douglas Mugwort	<i>Artemisia douglasiana</i>	64	635
California Buckwheat	<i>Eriogonum fasciculatum</i>	15	60
San Diego Sunflower	<i>Bahiopsis laciniata</i>	13	50
Deerweed	<i>Lotus scoparius</i>	13	50
Foothill Needlegrass	<i>Nasella lepida</i>	25	100
Dot Seed Plantain	<i>Plantago erecta</i>	6	25
Exserted Indian Paintbrush	<i>Castilleja exserta</i>	13	50
Herbaceous Species Total		369	3,132
Grand Total		671	5,420

Option B assumes dryland farming because no well is available or viable, and consists of both plantings of seeding of native species. This option will restore approximately 4 acres of coastal sage scrub north of Dulzura Creek, and 10 acres of southern riparian woodland south of the Creek. A summary of the proposed plant species and seed mix for Option B are provided in Tables 2 and 3 below.

Table 2. Option B (Dryland) Summary of Proposed Plant Species

Common Name	Scientific Name	Percent Composition	Estimated Plant Totals
Tree Species			
Fremont Cottonwood	<i>Populus fremontii</i>	5	60
Coast Live Oak	<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>	24	300
Red Willow	<i>Salix laevigata</i>	13	170
Gooding's Black Willow	<i>Salix goodingii</i>	17	210
Arroyo Willow	<i>Salix lasiolepis</i>	9	110
Total Tree Species		68	850
Shrub Species			
Narrowleaf Willow	<i>Salix exigua</i>	32	400
Total Shrub Species		32	400
Grand Total		100	1,250

Table 3. Option B (Dryland) Summary of Potential Seed Mix

Common Name	Scientific Name	Seeding Rate (lbs/acre)
California Sagebrush	<i>Artemisia californica</i>	4
Owl's Clover	<i>Castilleja exserta</i>	2
California Encelia	<i>Encelia californica</i>	2
California Buckwheat	<i>Eriogonum fasciculatum</i>	4
Golden Yarrow	<i>Eriophyllum confertifolium</i>	1
California Poppy	<i>Eschscholzia californica</i>	1
California Goldfields	<i>Lasthenia californica</i>	2
Deerweed	<i>Lotus scoparius</i>	2
Minature Lupine	<i>Lupinus bicolor</i>	1
Foothill Needlegrass	<i>Nasella lepida</i>	2
Purple Needlegrass	<i>Nasella pulchra</i>	2
Dot-seed Plantain	<i>Plantago erecta</i>	3
Lemondeberry	<i>Rhus integrifolia</i>	3
Black Sage	<i>Salvia mellifera</i>	4
Blue-eyed Grass	<i>Sisyrinchium bellum</i>	2
Small Fescue	<i>Vulpia microstachys</i>	1
Grand Total		36

Plant material (stem-cuttings, container stock) will be collected from as near the restoration unit as possible within the Otay River Watershed and propagated for revegetation purposes to ensure that the plant material is closely related genetically and is similarly adapted to the local climate, soils and hydrology as the plants within the Preserve. Weed control will continue on site to ensure the successful establishment of native plants.

To assess the effectiveness of the restoration, a comprehensive, rigorous and scientifically validated monitoring program will be used. Annual plant survival will be monitored after the first growing season using a complete

plant census, and this data is used to determine which species, if any, need supplemental re-plantings. In subsequent years, permanent plots will be monitored to determine annual survival, growth and foliage volume. Photo-points will be established at the beginning of the project and monitored on an annual basis to provide descriptive analysis of vegetative changes over the course of the project. Herbaceous plants and native grasses will be monitored using line transects measuring percent cover and species composition in 1m² plots. In addition, biologists will be on site weekly strategizing with field staff on irrigation needs, non-native control and other day-to-day operational procedures.

Avian point-count surveys will be conducted during the breeding season with the project area and within nearby reference (control) habitat. All monitoring activities of non-native removal success and restoration establishment will be reported in quarterly and year-end reports. These reports will also provide a detailed analysis and discussion, and adaptive management recommendations in the end-of-project report.

The project will utilize avoidance measures and methods that have been developed in coordination with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), and Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) over the past 10 years on several large watershed eradication programs (Santa Margarita, San Luis Rey, Carlsbad HU, San Dieguito, and San Diego watersheds) to address wildlife concerns. The main method is avoidance; that is, not being in habitat areas during active breeding of wildlife. Impacts to native vegetation are also minimized and avoided by following the measures detailed below. The resulting impacts to the habitat are minor and temporary and the resulting benefit is substantial and long-term. Controlling the target non-native species and revegetating with native species will restore ecological function to the site.

Intensive project enhancement and restoration activities will be carried out annually from September 15th to March 15th, which avoids/minimizes impacts to the breeding/reproductive season for wildlife, fish and native plants. In areas of coastal sage scrub, work in habitat adjacent to riparian zones will be completed by February 15th. Stands of vegetation that could be used by raptors and herons as nesting habitat will be surveyed prior to work activities and any sites with observed nesting activity will be avoided with appropriate buffers. Enhancement and restoration activities may be conducted between March 15th and September 15th if migratory bird surveys conducted by a qualified biologist determine that no active nests occur on site, and only after authorization from USFWS and CDFG has been obtained.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

The project site is within an existing County open space preserve located in the unincorporated community of Dulzura, immediately north and east of Highway 94. Open space preserve lands surround the project site, with the exception of sparse rural residential development to the north and northeast. Lands immediately to the south, west and northwest of the project site include the Hollenbeck Canyon Wildlife Area and the Rancho Jamul Ecological Reserve owned by the California Department and Game, as well as open space owned by the Bureau of Land Management.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

<u>Permit Type/Action</u>	<u>Agency</u>
401 Permit – Water Quality Certification	Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)
404 Permit – Dredge and Fill	US Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE)
1600 – Streambed Alteration Agreement	CA Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project and involve at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or a "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated," as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Aesthetics</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Agricultural & Forestry Resources</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Air Quality</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Biological Resources</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Cultural Resources</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Geology/Soils</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Hazards & Hazardous Materials</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Hydrology/Water Quality</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Land Use/Planning</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Mineral Resources</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Noise</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Population/Housing</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Public Services</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Recreation</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Transportation/Traffic</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Utilities/Service Systems</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Mandatory Findings of Significance</u> |

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☒ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Parks and Recreation finds that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Parks and Recreation finds that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Parks and Recreation finds that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.


Signature

Jessica Norton
Printed Name

9/14/2011
Date

Land Use/Environmental Planner
Title

I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

A vista is a view from a particular location or composite views along a roadway or trail. Scenic vistas often refer to views of natural lands, but may also be compositions of natural and developed areas, or even entirely of developed and unnatural areas, such as a scenic vista of a rural town and surrounding agricultural lands. What is scenic to one person may not be scenic to another, so the assessment of what constitutes a scenic vista must consider the perceptions of a variety of viewer groups.

The items that can be seen within a vista are visual resources. Adverse impacts to individual visual resources or the addition of structures or developed areas may or may not adversely affect the vista. Determining the level of impact to a scenic vista requires analyzing the changes to the vista as a whole and also to individual visual resources.

Less than Significant Impact: The project consists of the restoration of native habitat through the removal of invasive, non-native plants and will disturb some vegetation; however, visual impacts are expected to be temporary and minor as selected plants are being controlled and revegetation with native species occurs. The project will treat and/or remove stands of non-native, invasive plant species along Dulzura creek, which will make native shrubs and trees more visible and have the long-term effect of reducing the risk of devastating wildland riparian fires within the Preserve, which have negative effects of scenic vistas. Native shrubs and trees will eventually replace the structure and form of the controlled non-native plant species resulting in similar site conditions. Rock formations and creek channel areas will also have increased visibility. The net effect will be neutral to the scenic creek vistas by removing non-native vegetation that is impacting these resources and replacing it with native vegetation similar in composition to the surrounding habitat. Therefore, the project will not result in a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: State scenic highways refer to those highways that are officially designated by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) as scenic (Caltrans - California Scenic Highway Program). Generally, the area defined within a State scenic highway is the land adjacent to and visible from the vehicular right-of-way. There are no scenic highways designated within the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, the proposed project will not have any substantial adverse effect on a scenic resource within a State scenic highway.

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Visual character is the objective composition of the visible landscape within a viewshed. Visual character is based on the organization of the pattern elements line, form, color, and texture. Visual character is commonly discussed in terms of dominance, scale, diversity and continuity. Visual quality is the viewer's perception of the visual environment and varies based on exposure, sensitivity and expectation of the viewers. The existing visual character and quality of the project site and surrounding area can be characterized as open space areas.

The proposed project consists of the restoration of habitat through the removal of invasive, non-native plants and will disturb some vegetation; however, visual impacts are expected to be temporary and minor as selected plants are being controlled and native revegetation occurs. As native vegetation matures, it will eventually replace the structure and form of the non-native, invasive species and result in a vegetation composition similar to the surrounding native habitats. Therefore, the project will not result in any adverse project- or cumulative-level effects on visual character or quality on site or in the surrounding area.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any use of outdoor lighting or building materials with highly reflective properties such as highly reflective glass or high-gloss surface colors. Therefore, the project will not create any new sources of light pollution

that could contribute to skyglow, light trespass or glare and adversely affect day or nighttime views in area.

II. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES – Would the project:

- a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance (Important Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, or other agricultural resources, to non-agricultural use?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project site has land designated as Prime and Important Farmland. Historically, the floodplains and the lower hills in the general area were used for cattle grazing; however, the Preserve and adjacent Hollenbeck Canyon Wildlife Area lands to the west were acquired between 2000 and 2003 as a larger regional effort to conserve and protect sensitive species and their habitats. These lands are now maintained and managed as open space. The restoration of the natural habitat in this open space area would not convert or displace any existing agricultural uses, nor would it preclude future agricultural uses. Therefore, the project will not have significant adverse project or cumulative level impacts related to the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Farmland of Local Importance to a non-agricultural use.

- b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project site is zoned A72 General Agriculture, and is a designated Agricultural Preserve Area. However, the project consists of the restoration of habitat within an existing County open space preserve, which is not in conflict with this zoning designation or the special area regulations. Additionally, the project site is not under a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, there will be no conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.

- c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104 (g))?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is for habitat restoration within an existing County open space preserve and proposes the planting of additional native trees on site. The project site is currently zoned for general agriculture (A72) and the project is consistent with the existing zoning and a rezone of the property is not proposed. In addition, the County of San Diego does not have any existing Timberland Production Zones. Therefore, project implementation would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland or timberland production zones.

- d) Result in the loss of forest land, conversion of forest land to non-forest use, or involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is for habitat restoration within an existing County open space preserve. Project implementation will result in the restoration of forest land through the removal of invasive, non-native species and revegetation with native trees including coast live oak, Fremont cottonwood, and native willow species. Therefore, the project would not result in the loss or conversion of forest land to a non-forest use.

- e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Important Farmland or other agricultural resources, to non-agricultural use?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project site has land designated as Prime and Important Farmland and the surrounding area within a radius of one-quarter mile has land designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide and Local Importance, and agricultural operations including field crops. However, the proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts related to the

conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance to a non-agricultural use because none of the existing agricultural uses in the project area would be displaced, nor would future agricultural in the project area be precluded as a result of habitat restoration activities. Therefore, no potentially significant or cumulative level conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance to a non-agricultural use will occur as a result of this proposed project.

III. AIR QUALITY -- Would the project:

- a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Operation of the project will not result in increase of criteria pollutant emissions compared to the existing use of the subject area that was anticipated by the RAQS. The project will not emit toxic air contaminants as identified by the California Air Resources Board. Therefore, the project will not conflict or obstruct with the implementation of the RAQS nor the SIP on a project or cumulative level.

- b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

In general, air quality impacts from land use projects are the result of emissions from motor vehicles, and from short-term construction activities associated with such projects. The San Diego County Land Use Environment Group (LUEG) has established guidelines for determining significance which incorporate the San Diego Air Pollution Control District's (APCD) established screening-level criteria for all new source review (NSR) in APCD Rule 20.2. These screening-level criteria can be used as numeric methods to demonstrate that a project's total emissions (e.g., stationary and fugitive emissions, as well as emissions from mobile sources) would not result in a significant impact to air quality. Since APCD does not have screening-level criteria for emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), the use of the screening level for reactive organic compounds (ROC) from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) for the Coachella Valley (which are more appropriate for the San Diego Air Basin) are used.

Less than Significant Impact: The project will use some small machinery to complete project activities. No grading or soil movement will occur as part of the project activities. Emissions from the use of any equipment would be minimal, temporary and localized, resulting in pollutant emission below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance. The project does not propose any structures or facilities and no increase in vehicular trips is anticipated as a result of the project. Further, there are no substantial grading operations associated with the construction of the project. As such, the project will not violate any air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

- c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

San Diego County is presently in non-attainment for the 1-hour concentrations under the California Ambient Air Quality Standard (CAAQS) for Ozone (O_3). San Diego County is also presently in non-attainment for the annual geometric mean and for the 24-hour concentrations of Particulate Matter less than or equal to 10 microns (PM_{10}) under the CAAQS. O_3 is formed when volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (NO_x) react in the presence of sunlight. VOC sources include any source that burns fuels (e.g., gasoline, natural gas, wood, oil); solvents; petroleum processing and storage; and pesticides. Sources of PM_{10} in both urban and rural areas include: motor vehicles, wood burning stoves and fireplaces, dust from construction, landfills, agriculture, wildfires, brush/waste burning, and industrial sources of windblown dust from open lands.

Less than Significant Impact: Air quality emissions associated with the project include emissions of PM_{10} , NO_x and VOCs during work activities when small motorized equipment is being used. No grading operations are associated with the project. Emissions from small equipment use would be minimal, localized and temporary resulting in PM_{10} and VOC emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance. The project does not propose any structures or facilities and no increase in vehicular trips is anticipated as a result of the project. Further, there are no substantial grading operations associated with the project. Therefore, the proposed project is not expected to create a cumulatively considerable impact nor a considerable net increase of PM_{10} , or any O_3 precursors.

- d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Air quality regulators typically define sensitive receptors as schools (Preschool-12th Grade), hospitals, resident care facilities, or day-care centers, or other facilities that may house individuals with health conditions that would be adversely impacted by changes in air quality. The County of San Diego also considers residences as sensitive receptors since they house children and the elderly.

Less than Significant Impact: The following sensitive receptors have been identified within a quarter-mile (the radius determined by the SCAQMD in which the dilution of pollutants is typically significant) of the proposed project: surrounding residences. However, the project does not propose uses or activities that would result in exposure of these identified sensitive receptors to significant pollutant concentrations and will not place sensitive receptors near carbon monoxide hotspots. In addition, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations because the proposed project as well as the listed projects have emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: No potential sources of objectionable odors have been identified in association with the proposed project. As such, no impact from odors is anticipated.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:**a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, and the Biological Diversity Baseline Report for the Lawrence and Barbara Daley Preserve, dated January 2011, prepared by Technology Associates, it has been determined that the project site and surrounding area supports native vegetation, namely, southern riparian woodland, non-native grassland, and Diegan coastal sage scrub. In addition, multiple sensitive and/or special-status species have been recorded within the Preserve, including 11 plants and 19 animals.

Though the Preserve currently supports a number of wildlife species, most wildlife habitat within the project site is marginal as the vegetation is recovering from repeated wildfires, with the most recent being the 2007 Harris fire. In addition, significant patches of invasive, non-native plants have successfully colonized on the Preserve and are out-competing the native species. In general, these non-native plant species offer little to no ecological value to native wildlife. Particularly, giant reed has heavily colonized the creek banks and forms monotypic stands, which wildlife does not use as either breeding or foraging habitat. The project will restore this area and will enhance or increase breeding and/or foraging habitat, as well as increase the wildlife movement corridor along Dulzura Creek. Restoration within the Preserve is anticipated to provide a number of ecological and biological benefits over a relatively short time, for example, increased species richness of neo-tropical migratory birds is often seen within three years of restoration (Geupel et al. 1997, RHJV 2004).

The result of this project will be habitat improvement for the species known or with potential to occur in the project area. This project will employ generally accepted and proven methods that have been successfully used for invasive removal and restoration projects within other watersheds in California.

Work completed under the project will avoid adverse effects to candidate, sensitive, or special-status species and/or habitat by implementing the avoidance and minimization measures and design elements outlined in the project description and the Negative Declaration. These avoidance and minimization measures were taken directly from previously issued USFWS and CDFG permits for multiple non-native plant control programs in southern California that have been operating for the past 10 years, including multiple permit renewals. The threshold of significance that would result in potentially significant impacts occurring to wildlife (death or harassment of listed and unlisted wildlife) is unlikely to be breached as the methods were developed in coordination with the wildlife agencies in a manner to avoid impacts to wildlife. Work activities will occur when migratory species are not physically present on site, and activities will not occur during the bird breeding season when impacts to wildlife would be greater. This condition may be waived if migratory bird surveys conducted by a qualified biologist determine that no active nests occur on site, and only after authorization from USFWS and CDFG has been obtained. Impacts to native plants are also minimal as work methods assure that only target plants are controlled. Oversight by a biologist on site along with yearly reporting assures compliance with these restoration methods.

Therefore, as a result of project avoidance and minimization measures, and design considerations, the project will not have a substantial adverse effect on any candidate, sensitive, or special status species and would not contribute to cumulative impacts to these designated species. In addition, the proposed restoration activities will result in the overall improvement of native habitat benefitting species within the project area and helping to meet the goals, on a cumulative basis, of the MSCP.

- b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Based on the Biological Diversity Baseline Report for the Lawrence and Barbara Daley Preserve, dated January 2011, prepared by Technology Associates, it has been determined that the project site contains southern riparian woodland, non-native grassland, and Diegan coastal sage scrub. However, the restoration program will provide an overall net benefit to these riparian and sensitive habitats by enhancing biological function and improving habitat quality for listed and sensitive species.

Work completed under the project will avoid adverse effects to the riparian habitat and wildlife species that are found within the system by implementing the avoidance and minimization measures and design elements outlined in the project description and the Negative Declaration. Therefore, as a result of project design considerations and mitigation measures, the project will not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community. In addition, the proposed restoration activities will result in the overall improvement of riparian and sensitive habitats within the project area and helping to meet the goals, on a cumulative basis, of the South County MSCP.

- c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The non-native plant control and habitat restoration activities being carried out by the project will occur in federally protected wetlands defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The project will operate under ACOE Regional General Permit (RGP) No. 41. RGP No. 41 authorizes the removal of invasive, non-native plants from waters of the U.S., including wetlands, for purposes of habitat recovery consistent with the terms and conditions of the permit. This permit is issued under Section 404 and is in accordance with provisions of the Regulatory Programs of the ACOE for activities that cause only minimal individual and cumulative environmental impacts. The project will adhere to the permit terms and conditions as well as provide additional minimization and avoidance measures as outlined in the Negative Declaration. Therefore, no significant impacts will occur to wetlands or waters of the U.S. as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and under the jurisdiction of the ACOE.

- d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Wildlife movement surveys of the corridors leading to and from the project site have shown that Dulzura Creek, including the tributary along Hollenbeck Canyon, is an important movement corridor for a variety of medium- and large-sized mammals as well as neo-tropical birds (USGS 2002). The project will restore and enhance habitat and wildlife linkages along Dulzura Creek. Avoidance and minimization measures, such as avoiding the use of heavy equipment during the bird breeding season and conducting nesting bird surveys prior to other enhancement and restoration activities taking place during the breeding season, have been incorporated into the project to ensure that there will be no interference with a wildlife nursery site.

Additionally, implementation of the proposed project would not contribute to any significant cumulative impacts to biological resources that are anticipated to occur through implementation of past, present and foreseeable projects in the Dulzura Creek area. The project is consistent with regional conservation planning principles, as it would restore and enhance stretches of sensitive habitats and would maintain connectivity with adjacent undeveloped lands.

- e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. The project is for habitat restoration within an existing County open space preserve, including invasive removal and revegetation with native species, which will provide a net benefit to the biological resources on site. This project is located within a designated Resource Conservation Area and is consistent with the goals and policies of the County's: General Plan Conservation/Open Space Element and Jamul/Dulzura Subregional Plan; Zoning Ordinance; Resource Protection Ordinance; and Habitat Loss Permit Ordinance. Therefore, there are no impacts.

- f) Conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan. The proposed project site is located within the County of San Diego's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) South County Subarea Plan. Per the South County Subarea Plan, all habitat restoration and enhancement activities are permitted within the MSCP preserve subject to the approval of the preserve manager/landowner and obtaining necessary permits. The Preserve is owned and managed by DPR, and this work is being conducted under the authorization of DPR. In addition, DPR will obtain all necessary permits prior to commencement of work. Therefore, there are no impacts.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the Preserve by archaeologists Andrew R. Pignuolo, Jose Aguilar, Spencer Bietz, Frank

Dittmer, Erin Mick, Jenna Santy, Bekah Loveless, Elizabeth Davidson and Bobby Bolger, as well as Native American monitors Justin Linton, Rachel Leash and Ben Leash, conducted between September 22 and November 13, 2009, it has been determined that there are one or more historical resources within the project site. These resources include an advertisement painted on a granitic boulder and rock wall features.

A cultural resources report titled, *Cultural Resource Phase I Survey and Inventory of the Lawrence and Barbara Daley Preserve Project, Dulzura, San Diego County, California*, prepared by Laguna Mountain Environmental, Inc., dated February 2010 evaluated these historical resources based on a review of historical records including literature reviews, Native American consultation, historic map checks, field survey, resource documentation and an architectural evaluation. These historical resources have not been previously evaluated for resource importance, and resource testing to evaluate these resources was not conducted as part of the survey and inventory effort. However, the project will not directly impact these resources.

Potential impacts have been reduced to a level below significant with the implementation of project design considerations including complete avoidance of known resources and the presence of an archaeological monitor for all ground disturbing activities. Moreover, because the historic resources will be completely avoided and will not be modified in any way, the project will not contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact on historical resources. Therefore, the project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the Preserve by archaeologists Andrew R. Pignolo, Jose Aguilar, Spencer Bietz, Frank Dittmer, Erin Mick, Jenna Santy, Bekah Loveless, Elizabeth Davidson and Bobby Bolger, as well as Native American monitors Justin Linton, Rachel Leash and Ben Leash, conducted between September 22 and November 13, 2009, it has been determined that there are one or more archaeological resources within the project site. These resources include prehistoric isolates, temporary camps, bedrock milling stations and lithic scatters.

A cultural resources report titled, *Cultural Resource Phase I Survey and Inventory of the Lawrence and Barbara Daley Preserve Project, Dulzura, San Diego County, California*, prepared by Laguna Mountain Environmental, Inc., dated February 2010 evaluated these archaeological resources based on a review of historical records including

literature reviews, Native American consultation, historic map checks, field survey, resource documentation and an architectural evaluation. Prehistoric isolates are not considered significant under the California Register or CEQA. The other archaeological resources have not been previously evaluated for resource importance, and resource testing to evaluate these resources was not conducted as part of the survey and inventory effort. However, the project will not directly impact these resources.

Potential impacts have been avoided through the implementation of project design considerations including complete avoidance of known archaeological resources and the presence of an archaeological monitor for all ground disturbing activities. Moreover, because the archaeological resources will be completely avoided and will not be modified in any way, the project will not contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact on historical resources. Therefore, the project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

San Diego County has a variety of geologic environments and geologic processes which generally occur in other parts of the state, country, and the world. However, some features stand out as being unique in one way or another within the boundaries of the County.

No Impact: The site does not contain any unique geologic features that have been listed in the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Unique Geology Resources nor does the site support any known geologic characteristics that have the potential to support unique geologic features.

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the Preserve by archaeologists Andrew R. Pignuolo, Jose Aguilar, Spencer Bietz, Frank Dittmer, Erin Mick, Jenna Santy, Bekah Loveless, Elizabeth Davidson and Bobby Bolger, as well as Native American monitors Justin Linton, Rachel Leash and Ben Leash, conducted

between September 22 and November 13, 2009, it has been determined that the project will not disturb any human remains because the project site does not include a formal cemetery or any archaeological resources that might contain interred human remains. The results of the survey are provided in the cultural resources report titled, *Cultural Resource Phase I Survey and Inventory of the Lawrence and Barbara Daley Preserve Project, Dulzura, San Diego County, California*, prepared by Laguna Mountain Environmental, Inc., dated February 2010. In addition, project is conditioned to provide an archaeological monitor for all ground disturbing activities. Therefore, the project will not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

- i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?
Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is not located in a fault rupture hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Interim Revision 2007, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California, or located within any other area with substantial evidence of a known fault. Therefore, there will be no impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known fault-rupture hazard zone as a result of this project.

- ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The *Uniform Building Code* (UBC) and the *California Building Code* (CBC) classifies all San Diego County with the highest seismic zone criteria, Zone 4. However, the project does not propose structures, only habitat restoration activities including invasive, non-native plant removal/control and revegetation of native species. Therefore, the project will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is not within a "Potential Liquefaction Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. This indicates that the geologic environment of the project site is not susceptible to ground failure from seismic activity. In addition, the project does not propose any structures. Therefore, there will be no impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known area susceptible to ground failure, including liquefaction.

iv. Landslides?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project site is located within a "Landslide Susceptibility Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. However, the project consists of habitat restoration. No structures are proposed and there will be no landform modification. Therefore, there will be no potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from landslides.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as Ramona, Cienega-Fallbrook, Fallbrook, Escondido and Visalia soil associations. These soils have erodibility ratings that range from "slight" to "moderate" as indicated by the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service, dated December 1973. However, the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil for the following reasons:

- The project will not result in unprotected erodible soils, will not alter existing drainage patterns, and will not develop steep slopes.
- The project will include Best Management Practices (BMPs) to ensure sediment does not erode from the proposed project site.
- The project does not involve grading.

Due to these factors, it has been found that the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil on a project level.

In addition, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact because all the of past, present and future projects included on the list of projects that involve grading or land disturbance are required to follow the requirements of the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING); California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), San Diego Region Order No. R9-2007-0001, NPDES No. CAS0108758, issued January 24, 2007; County Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ord. No. 9926 revised March 2008); and County Storm Water Standards Manual adopted February 20, 2002, and amended August 5, 2003 (Ordinance No. 9589). Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

- c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is not located on or near geological formations that are unstable or would potentially become unstable as a result of the project. Additionally, the project will not alter the land in any way as to create unstable conditions as the project does not propose landform alteration. For further information refer to Section VI. Geology and Soils, Question a., i-iv listed above.

- d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not contain expansive soils as defined by Table 18-I-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). The soils on-site include Ramona, Cienega-Fallbrook, Fallbrook, Escondido and Visalia soil associations. These soils have a shrink-swell behavior of low and represent no substantial risks to life or property. Therefore, the project will not create a substantial risk to life or property. This was confirmed by staff review of the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973.

- e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is for habitat restoration. The project does not propose any septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems since no wastewater will be generated.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:

- a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is for habitat restoration, which will not result in the generation of any new vehicle trips or generate additional greenhouse gases in any way. Furthermore, the planting of additional native vegetation will help sequester carbon dioxide from the environment. Therefore, there will be no impact.

- b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is for habitat restoration, which will not result in the generation of any new vehicle trips or generate additional greenhouse gases in any way. Furthermore, the planting of additional native vegetation will help sequester carbon dioxide from the environment. Therefore, the project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of GHGs.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project:

- a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Fuel and plant herbicides (e.g., glyphosate) will be transported and used on site during habitat restoration. Plant herbicides used in the restoration of sites have a very low toxicity ("caution" ratings) and formulations approved by the EPA for use in aquatic areas will be used. No disposal of materials will occur at project sites. The following BMPs will be in place to ensure that there are no significant impacts to the environment:

- The transport of hazardous materials is regulated by the State and the transport of such materials to the site would comply with these regulations.
- During restoration activities, contractors will employ best management practices for spill control and prevention. With prevention and management in place, any spills of hazardous materials are considered less than significant.
- Restoration equipment storage and maintenance will be conducted in non-wetland areas.
- All mixing of herbicides and maintenance of equipment will occur only in areas that are devoid of vegetation.

In addition, the project does not propose to demolish any existing structures on site and therefore would not create a hazard related to the release of asbestos, lead based paint or other hazardous materials from demolition activities. Therefore, the project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

- b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Some hazardous materials, such as fuel and plant herbicides, would be transported and used at the site during restoration activities, which could create a hazard to the environment should a spill occur. However, plant herbicides used in the restoration of sites have a very low toxicity ("caution" ratings) and formulations approved for use in aquatic areas will be used. The BMPs incorporated into the project (see Question VIII.a above) would reduce the hazards to a less than significant level.

- c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Therefore, the project will not have any effect on an existing or proposed school.

- d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, or is otherwise known to have been subject to a release of hazardous substances and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on a site visit and records search, the project site has not been subject to a release of hazardous substances. The project site is not included in any of the following lists or databases: the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances sites list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, the San Diego County Hazardous Materials Establishment database, the San Diego County DEH Site Assessment and Mitigation (SAM) Case Listing, the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Site Mitigation and Brownfields Reuse Program Database ("CalSites" Envirostor Database), the Resource Conservation and Recovery Information

System (RCRIS) listing, the EPA's Superfund CERCLIS database or the EPA's National Priorities List (NPL).

Additionally, the project does not propose structures for human occupancy or significant linear excavation within 1,000 feet of an open, abandoned, or closed landfill, is not located on or within 250 feet of the boundary of a parcel identified as containing burn ash (from the historic burning of trash), is not on or within 1,000 feet of a Formerly Used Defense Site (FUDS), does not contain a leaking Underground Storage Tank, and is not located on a site with the potential for contamination from historic uses such as intensive agriculture, industrial uses, a gas station or vehicle repair shop. Therefore, the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment.

- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP), or within two miles of a public airport. Also, the project does not propose construction of any structure equal to or greater than 150 feet in height, constituting a safety hazard to aircraft and/or operations from an airport or heliport. Therefore, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not within one mile of a private airstrip. As a result, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

- g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

The following sections summarize the project's consistency with applicable emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans.

i. OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN AND MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN:

Less than Significant Impact: The Operational Area Emergency Plan is a comprehensive emergency plan that defines responsibilities, establishes an emergency organization, defines lines of communications, and is designed to be part of the statewide Standardized Emergency Management System. The Operational Area Emergency Plan provides guidance for emergency planning and requires subsequent plans to be established by each jurisdiction that has responsibilities in a disaster situation. The Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan includes an overview of the risk assessment process, identifies hazards present in the jurisdiction, hazard profiles, and vulnerability assessments. The plan also identifies goals, objectives and actions for each jurisdiction in the County of San Diego, including all cities and the County unincorporated areas. The project will not interfere with this plan because it will not prohibit subsequent plans from being established or prevent the goals and objectives of existing plans from being carried out.

ii. SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN

No Impact: The San Diego County Nuclear Power Station Emergency Response Plan will not be interfered with by the project due to the location of the project, plant and the specific requirements of the plan. The emergency plan for the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station includes an emergency planning zone within a 10-mile radius. All land area within 10 miles of the plant is not within the jurisdiction of the unincorporated County and as such a project in the unincorporated area is not expected to interfere with any response or evacuation.

iii. OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT

No Impact: The Oil Spill Contingency Element will not be interfered with because the project is not located along the coastal zone or coastline.

iv. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN

No Impact: The Emergency Water Contingencies Annex and Energy Shortage Response Plan will not be interfered with because the project does not propose altering major water or energy supply infrastructure, such as the California Aqueduct.

v. DAM EVACUATION PLAN

No Impact: The Dam Evacuation Plan will not be interfered with because the project is not located within a dam inundation zone.

- h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The proposed project is within habitat that may be considered wildlands that have the potential to support wildland fires. However, the project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires because no habitable structures are proposed. The control of giant reed and other non-native plants and replacement with native vegetation will reduce the risk of wildland fire. A significant reduction of fire risk will occur as a result.

- i) Propose a use, or place residents adjacent to an existing or reasonably foreseeable use that would substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies, which are capable of transmitting significant public health diseases or nuisances?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The proposed project is within habitat that may be considered wildlands that have the potential to support vectors. However, the control of giant reed and other non-native plants, and replacement with native vegetation will reduce the risk of vectors because large stands of non-native plants clog creeks and reduce water flow, creating habitat preferred by vectors. A significant reduction of risk of vectors will occur as a result.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:

- a) Violate any waste discharge requirements?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project does not propose waste discharges that require waste discharge requirement permits or NPDES permits. Restoration activities will not impact channel areas with water flow or result in the discharge of any contaminants. No mechanized grading/soil disturbance is included in the project scope and no biomass will be placed in active creek channels. Aquatic approved herbicides will be used for treatments of non-native plants. These herbicides are approved for use by open water by the EPA. No direct applications of herbicide to water will occur. The project will operate under ACOE RGP No. 41, which is certified pursuant to Section 401 of the Clean Water Act (Water Quality Certification) subject to the standard conditions that apply to all certifications as well as additional conditions required under the RGP. The project will adhere to all required conditions of this RGP. Therefore, the project will not violate any waste discharge requirements.

- b) Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, could the project result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project lies in the 910.36 Hollenbeck hydrologic sub-area within the Otay hydrologic unit. According to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, March 2007, the Lower Otay Reservoir is impaired for color, iron, manganese, total ammonia and pH (high); Pogi Canyon Creek is impaired for DDT; and the Pacific Ocean Shoreline and San Diego Bay are impaired for polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) and copper. However, the project proposes the restoration of native habitat and will not increase these pollution loads. No herbicides being used for the project activities are listed as 303(d) impairments. Therefore, the project will not result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired.

- c) Could the proposed project cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Incorporated

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The RWQCB has designated water quality objectives for waters of the San Diego Region as outlined in Chapter 3 of the Water Quality Control Plan (Plan). The water quality objectives are necessary to protect the existing and potential beneficial uses of each hydrologic unit as described in Chapter 2 of the Plan.

The project lies in the 910.36 Hollenbeck hydrologic sub-area, within the Otay hydrologic unit that has the following existing and potential beneficial uses for Dulzura Creek: municipal and domestic supply; agricultural supply; industrial process supply; industrial service supply; contact water recreation; non-contact water recreation; warm freshwater habitat; preservation of biological habitats of special significance; wildlife habitat; and, rare, threatened, or endangered species habitat.

The project proposes habitat restoration (invasive, non-native plant control and revegetation of native species). The project does not involve grading or alteration of landform and will not affect water quality. Aquatic approved herbicides will be used for treatments of non-native plants. These herbicides are approved for use in aquatic habitats by the EPA. No direct applications of herbicides to water will occur. Treatments do not occur during rain events or when rain is forecast within 24 hours. Migration of the herbicide into water does not occur at significant levels, even when precipitation occurs after treatments have been completed. Therefore, the project will not cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses.

- d) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Incorporated | |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Phase II of the project proposes one of two site-specific planting designs: Option A proposes the use of an existing well located on an adjacent property, and Option B proposes dryland farming techniques. If Option A is chosen, the project will utilize an existing well for irrigation of the approximately 14-acre restoration area via a series of drip lines. In order to ensure a reasonable and reliable watering regime, the number of overall plants and composition within the restoration area would be adjusted to fit the capacity of the existing well and would not be expected to

substantially deplete groundwater supplies. In addition, the project will treat numerous stands of giant reed, which utilizes twice as much water as native riparian woody vegetation and is known to change hydrologic regimes by reducing groundwater availability, thereby resulting in increased supply of groundwater and increased filtration, which will help raise groundwater levels.

Furthermore, the project does not involve operations that would interfere substantially with groundwater recharge including, but not limited to the following: the project does not involve regional diversion of water to another groundwater basin; or diversion or channelization of a stream course or waterway with impervious layers, such as concrete lining or culverts, for substantial distances (e.g., one-quarter mile). These activities and operations can substantially affect rates of groundwater recharge. Therefore, impacts to groundwater supplies will be less than significant.

- e) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project will not change or modify the low flow channel position. No structures of bank channel modifications will occur as part of the project. The soil surface will not be disturbed; therefore, no substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site will occur.

- f) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project will not change or modify the low flow channel position. No construction structures or bank channel modifications will occur as part of the project. The risk of flooding will actually be reduced by the restoration project through the reduction of giant reed biomass in the flood zone, which is documented as increasing flood risk in riparian areas. Therefore, the project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a

stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site.

- g) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: There are no existing or planned storm water drainage systems proposed by the project, nor does the project require such systems.

- h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any known additional sources of polluted runoff. In addition, the project does not propose new storm water drainage facilities.

- i) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including County Floodplain Maps?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not involve the placement of housing. Therefore, no impact will occur.

- j) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: No structures are proposed; therefore, no impact will occur.

- k) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project consists of habitat restoration and does not propose structures and, therefore, will not expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding.

- l) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site lies outside a mapped dam inundation area for a major dam/reservoir within San Diego County. In addition, the project is not located immediately downstream of a minor dam that could potentially flood the property. Therefore, the project will not expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding.

- m) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

- i. SEICHE

No Impact: The project site is not located along the shoreline of a lake or reservoir; therefore, could not be inundated by a seiche.

- ii. TSUNAMI

No Impact: The project site is located more than a mile from the coast; therefore, in the event of a tsunami, would not be inundated.

iii. MUDFLOW

Less than Significant Impact: Mudflow is type of landslide. The site is located within a moderate to high landslide susceptibility zone. However, the project is for habitat restoration and proposes minimal land disturbance that will expose a small amount of unprotected soils. In addition, the project site is located at the bottom of a canyon surrounded by steeply sloping ridges and does not propose any structures. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the project will expose people or property to inundation due to a mudflow.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING -- Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose the introduction of new infrastructure such as major roadways or water supply systems, or utilities to the area. Therefore, the proposed project will not significantly disrupt or divide the established community.

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is subject to the General Plan Land Use Designation Open Space-Conservation and the proposed enhancement/restoration activities are consistent with the goals and policies of the General Plan's Conservation and Open Space Element. The project is also subject to the policies of the Jamul/Dulzura Subregional Plan. The project site is located within an identified Resource Conservation Area and the project is consistent with the Conservation Goals and Policies of this Plan. The project site is zoned A72, General Agriculture, and is a designated Agricultural Preserve Area. The project consists of the restoration of habitat

within an existing County open space preserve, which is not in conflict with this zoning designation or the special area regulations. Therefore, the project does not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect

- c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan. The proposed project site is located within the County of San Diego's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) South County Subarea Plan. Per the South County Subarea Plan, all habitat restoration and enhancement activities are permitted within the MSCP preserve subject to the approval of the preserve manager/landowner and obtaining necessary permits. The Preserve is owned and managed by DPR, and this work is being conducted under the authorization of DPR. In addition, DPR will obtain all necessary permits prior to commencement of work. Therefore, there are no impacts.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not entail any paving, construction, or other features that would result in future preclusion of mineral extraction. Therefore, there is no impact.

- b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is not considered to be an Extractive Use Zone (S-82) nor does it have an Impact Sensitive Land Use Designation (24) with an Extractive Land Use Overlay (25) (County Land Use Element, 2000). Therefore, no potentially significant loss of availability of a known mineral resource of locally important mineral resource recovery (extraction) site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan will occur as a result of this project.

XII. NOISE -- Would the project result in:

- a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The proposed project consists of habitat restoration within an existing County open space preserve and will not support any permanent noise-generating equipment. The project may involve the use of powered equipment (e.g., mowers and chainsaws) resulting in a temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels. However, the area surrounding the project site consists entirely of open space preserve lands and the nearest residence, which is considered a noise sensitive area, is over 1,000 feet away from where activities utilizing powered equipment will be conducted. Work using powered equipment will be conducted outside of the bird breeding season (September 15 to March 15), annually. This condition may be waived if nesting bird surveys determine no active nests occur on site and if authorized by the USFWS and CDFG. Noise generated from the restoration activities are insignificant in comparison to the noise generated from the adjacent Highway 94. In addition, temporary noise as a result of work will be achieved with machinery that does not generate noise levels in excess of County noise standards, and work will be conducted during permitted hours of operation (7 AM to 7 PM) pursuant to the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.410). Therefore, the project will not expose people to or generate any noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan or Noise Ordinances, and other applicable local, State and Federal noise control regulations.

- b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any of the following land uses that can be impacted by groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels:

- Buildings where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operation, including research and manufacturing facilities with special vibration constraints.
- Residences and buildings where people normally sleep including hotels, hospitals, residences and where low ambient vibration is preferred.
- Civic and institutional land uses including schools, churches, libraries, other institutions, and quiet offices where low ambient vibration is preferred.
- Concert halls for symphonies or other special use facilities where low ambient vibration is preferred.

Also, the project does not propose any major, new or expanded infrastructure such as mass transit, highways or major roadways or intensive extractive industry that could generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels on-site or in the surrounding area.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Studies completed by the Organization of Industry Standards (ISO 362; ISO 1996 1-3; ISO 3095; and ISO 3740-3747) state an increase of 10 dB is perceived twice as loud and is perceived as a significant increase in the ambient noise level. The proposed project is for habitat restoration only and does not support any permanent noise-generating equipment and would not result in an increase in noise levels by 10 dB. However, the project involves the following noise sources that may increase the ambient noise level: temporary and periodic use of powered equipment (e.g., mowers and chainsaws). As indicated in the response listed under Section XII. Noise, Question a., the project is not within the vicinity of existing or planned noise sensitive areas and would not result in noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State and Federal noise control.

The project will not result in cumulative noise impacts because a list of past, present, and future projects within the vicinity were evaluated. It was determined that the project in combination with a list of past, present and future projects would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to noise 10 dB CNEL over existing ambient noise levels. Refer to XVIII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

- d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project does not involve any uses that may create substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity including, but not limited to, extractive industry; outdoor commercial or industrial uses that involve crushing, cutting, drilling, grinding, or blasting of raw materials; truck depots, transfer stations or delivery areas; or outdoor sound systems. Any temporary increase over existing ambient levels when powered equipment (e.g., mowers and chainsaws) is used is not expected to exceed the noise limits of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.410). Equipment operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation (7 AM to 7 PM). Also, the project will not operate equipment in excess of 75 dB for more than 8 hours during a 24-hour period. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.

- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) for airports or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within a one-mile vicinity of a private airstrip; therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:

- a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project will not induce substantial population growth in an area because the project does not propose any physical or regulatory change that would remove a restriction to or encourage population growth in an area including, but limited to the following: new or extended infrastructure or public facilities; new commercial or industrial facilities; large-scale residential development; accelerated conversion of homes to commercial or multi-family use; or regulatory changes including General Plan amendments, specific plan amendments, zone reclassifications, sewer or water annexations; or LAFCO annexation actions.

- b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is for habitat restoration and will not displace any existing housing since the project site is currently vacant and is within the boundaries of an existing County open space preserve.

- c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is for habitat restoration and will not displace a substantial number of people since the project site is currently vacant and is within the boundaries of an existing County open space preserve.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

- a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

- i. Fire protection?
- ii. Police protection?
- iii. Schools?
- iv. Parks?
- v. Other public facilities?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not involve the construction of new or physically altered governmental facilities including, but not limited to, fire protection facilities, sheriff facilities, schools, or parks in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios or objectives for any public services. Therefore, the project will not have an adverse physical effect on the environment because the project does not require new or significantly altered services or facilities to be constructed.

XV. RECREATION

- a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any residential use including, but not limited to, a residential subdivision, mobile home park, or construction for a single-family residence that may increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities in the vicinity.

- b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any residential use including, but not limited to, a residential subdivision, mobile home park, or construction for a single-family residence that may increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities in the vicinity.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:

- a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is for habitat restoration within a County open space preserve. No facilities are being constructed and the project will not result in any additional ADTs. Therefore, the project will have no impact on traffic volume and will not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.

- b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is for habitat restoration within a County open space preserve. No facilities are being constructed and the project will not result in any additional ADTs. Therefore, the project will have no impact on traffic volume and will not conflict with an applicable congestion management program including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.

- c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is located outside of an Airport Influence Area and is not located within two miles of a public or public use airport; therefore, the project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns.

- d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project will not alter traffic patterns, roadway design, place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways, or create or place curves, slopes or walls which impede adequate sight distance on a road.

- e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project will not result in inadequate emergency access. The project is for habitat restoration and does not require emergency access.

- f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is for habitat restoration within a County open space preserve. No facilities are being constructed and the project will not result in any additional ADTs. Therefore, the project will not conflict with policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:

- a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not involve any uses that will discharge any wastewater to sanitary sewer or on-site wastewater systems (septic). Therefore, the project will not exceed any wastewater treatment requirements.

- b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not include new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. In addition, the project does not require the construction or expansion of water or wastewater treatment facilities. Therefore, the project will not require any construction of new or expanded facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects.

- c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not include new or expanded storm water drainage facilities. Therefore, the project will not cause any significant environmental effects.

- d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project does not involve or require water services from a water district. The project is for habitat restoration and does not rely on water service for any purpose.

- e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project does not use sewer services or generate waste water; therefore, the project will not interfere with any wastewater treatment provider's service capacity.

- f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Implementation of the project may generate small amounts of solid waste brought on site from contractors conducting the restoration project activities. However, all solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440 et seq.). There are five, permitted active landfills in San Diego County with remaining capacity. Therefore, in the event removal of trash and/or debris is required to implement the project, there is sufficient existing permitted solid waste capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.

- g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Implementation of the project may generate small amounts of solid waste brought on site from contractors conducting the restoration project activities. All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440 et seq.). The project will deposit all solid waste at a permitted solid waste facility and, therefore, will comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

- a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a

plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
 ☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
 ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory were considered in the response to each question in sections IV and V of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for significant cumulative effects. There is no substantial evidence that there are biological or cultural resources that are affected or associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

- b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
 ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
 ☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

The following list of past, present and future projects were considered and evaluated as a part of this Initial Study:

PROJECT NAME	PERMIT NUMBER	PERMIT STATUS
SBA Dulzura – Minor Use	3400 00-093	Approved
CA8412 Sycamore Canyon – Major Use	3300 05-016	Withdrawn
Robnett Property – Tentative Parcel Map	3200 20726	Approved
Deichler – Tentative Parcel Map	3200 20781	Withdrawn

No Impact: Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse cumulative effects were considered in the response to each question in sections I through XVII of this form. In addition to project specific

impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for incremental effects that are cumulatively considerable. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that there are cumulative effects associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

- c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: In the evaluation of environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts to human beings were considered in the response to certain questions in sections: I. Aesthetics, III. Air Quality, VI. Geology and Soils, VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials, IX. Hydrology and Water Quality, XII. Noise, XIII. Population and Housing, and XVI. Transportation and Traffic. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that there are adverse effects on human beings associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

XIV. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THE INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

All references to Federal, State and local regulation are available on the Internet. For Federal regulations refer to <http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/>. For State regulations refer to www.leginfo.ca.gov. For County regulations refer to www.amlegal.com. All other references are available upon request.

Geupel, G.R., G. Ballard, N. Nur & A. King. 1997. Population status and habitat associations along riparian corridor of the Lower Sacramento River: Results from 1995 field season and summary of results 1993 to 1995. Point Reyes Bird Observatory, Stinson Beach, CA.

Laguna Mountain Environmental, Inc. 2010. Cultural Resource Phase I Survey and Inventory of the Lawrence and Barbara Daley Preserve Project, Dulzura, San Diego County, California. Prepared for the County of San Diego Department of Parks and Recreation.

RHJV (Riparian Habitat Joint Venture). 2004. The riparian bird conservation plan: a strategy for reversing the decline of riparian associated birds in California. California Partners in Flight.

River Partners. 2011. Riparian Restoration Plan for the Lawrence and Barbara Daley Preserve Riparian Restoration Project. Prepared for the San Diego Association of Governments and the County of San Diego, Department of Parks and Recreation.

TAIC (Technology Associates International Corporation). 2011. Biological Diversity Baseline Report for the Lawrence and Barbara Daley Preserve, County of San

Diego. Prepared for the County of San Diego, Department of Parks and Recreation.

USGS (U.S. Geological Survey). 2002. Baseline Biodiversity Survey for the Rancho Jamul Ecological Reserve. Final Report prepared for the California Department of Fish and Game by the USGS Western Ecological Research Center.

AESTHETICS

California Street and Highways Code [California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283. (<http://www.leginfo.ca.gov>)

California Scenic Highway Program, California Streets and Highways Code, Section 260-283. (<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/scpr.htm>)

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. Sections 5200-5299; 5700-5799; 5900-5910, 6322-6326. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-73: Hillside Development Policy. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-104: Policy and Procedures for Preparation of Community Design Guidelines, Section 396.10 of the County Administrative Code and Section 5750 et seq. of the County Zoning Ordinance. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, General Plan, Scenic Highway Element VI and Scenic Highway Program. (ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Light Pollution Code, Title 5, Division 9 (Sections 59.101-59.115 of the County Code of Regulatory Ordinances) as added by Ordinance No 6900, effective January 18, 1985, and amended July 17, 1986 by Ordinance No. 7155. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego Wireless Communications Ordinance [San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances. (www.amlegal.com)

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County. (Alpine, Bonsall, Fallbrook, Julian, Lakeside, Ramona, Spring Valley, Sweetwater, Valley Center).

Federal Communications Commission, Telecommunications Act of 1996 [Telecommunications Act of 1996, Pub. LA. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56 (1996). (<http://www.fcc.gov/Reports/tcom1996.txt>)

Institution of Lighting Engineers, Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Light Pollution, Warwickshire, UK, 2000 (<http://www.dark-skies.org/file-gd-e.htm>)

International Light Inc., Light Measurement Handbook, 1997. (www.intl-light.com)

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Lighting Research Center, National Lighting Product Information Program (NLPPI), Lighting Answers, Volume 7, Issue 2, March 2003. (www.lrc.rpi.edu)

US Census Bureau, Census 2000, Urbanized Area Outline Map, San Diego, CA. (<http://www.census.gov/geo/www/maps/ua2kmaps.htm>)

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System. (www.blm.gov)

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.

US Department of Transportation, National Highway System Act of 1995 [Title III, Section 304. Design Criteria for the National Highway System. (<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legisregs/nhsdatoc.html>)

AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, "A Guide to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program," November 1994. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Office of Land Conversion, "California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model Instruction Manual," 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Farmland Conservancy Program, 1996. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Land Conservation (Williamson) Act, 1965. (www.ceres.ca.gov, www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Right to Farm Act, as amended 1996. (www.qp.gov.bc.ca)

County of San Diego Agricultural Enterprises and Consumer Information Ordinance, 1994, Title 6, Division 3, Ch. 4. Sections 63.401-63.408. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Department of Agriculture, Weights and Measures, "2002 Crop Statistics and Annual Report," 2002. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System. (www.nrcs.usda.gov, www.swcs.org).

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. (soils.usda.gov)

AIR QUALITY

CEQA Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook, South Coast Air Quality Management District, Revised November 1993. (www.aqmd.gov)

County of San Diego Air Pollution Control District's Rules and Regulations, updated August 2003. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Federal Clean Air Act US Code; Title 42; Chapter 85 Subchapter 1. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

BIOLOGY

California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). Southern California Coastal Sage Scrub Natural Community Conservation Planning Process Guidelines. CDFG and California Resources Agency, Sacramento, California. 1993. (www.dfg.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, An Ordinance Amending the San Diego County Code to Establish a Process for Issuance of the Coastal Sage Scrub Habitat Loss Permits and Declaring the Urgency Thereof to Take Effect Immediately, Ordinance No. 8365. 1994, Title 8, Div 6, Ch. 1. Sections 86.101-86.105, 87.202.2. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Ord. Nos. 8845, 9246, 1998 (new series). (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Implementing Agreement by and between United States Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game and County of San Diego. County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, 1998.

County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, County of San Diego Subarea Plan, 1997.

Holland, R.R. Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California. State of California, Resources Agency, Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento, California, 1986.

Memorandum of Understanding [Agreement Between United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF), San Diego County Fire Chief's Association and the Fire District's Association of San Diego County.

Stanislaus Audubon Society, Inc. v County of Stanislaus (5th Dist. 1995) 33 Cal.App.4th 144, 155-159 [39 Cal. Rptr.2d 54]. (www.ceres.ca.gov)

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Environmental Laboratory. Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Wetlands Research Program

Technical Report Y-87-1. 1987.
(<http://www.wes.army.mil/>)

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. America's wetlands: our vital link between land and water. Office of Water, Office of Wetlands, Oceans and Watersheds. EPA843-K-95-001. 1995b. (www.epa.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Habitat Conservation Planning Handbook. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1996. (endangered.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Consultation Handbook: Procedures for Conducting Consultation and Conference Activities Under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1998. (endangered.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Environmental Assessment and Land Protection Plan for the Vernal Pools Stewardship Project. Portland, Oregon. 1997.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Vernal Pools of Southern California Recovery Plan. U.S. Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Region One, Portland, Oregon, 1998. (ecos.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Birds of conservation concern 2002. Division of Migratory. 2002. (migratorybirds.fws.gov)

CULTURAL RESOURCES

California Health & Safety Code. §18950-18961, State Historic Building Code. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §5020-5029, Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §7050.5, Human Remains. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, (AB 978), 2001. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code §5024.1, Register of Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5031-5033, State Landmarks. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5097-5097.6, Archaeological, Paleontological, and Historic Sites. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5097.9-5097.991, Native American Heritage. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

City of San Diego. Paleontological Guidelines. (revised) August 1998.

County of San Diego, Local Register of Historical Resources (Ordinance 9493), 2002. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Demere, Thomas A., and Stephen L. Walsh. Paleontological Resources San Diego County. Department of Paleontology, San Diego Natural History Museum. 1994.

Moore, Ellen J. Fossil Mollusks of San Diego County. San Diego Society of Natural history. Occasional; Paper 15. 1968.

U.S. Code including: American Antiquities Act (16 USC §431-433) 1906. Historic Sites, Buildings, and Antiquities Act (16 USC §461-467), 1935. Reservoir Salvage Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1960. Department of Transportation Act (49 USC §303) 1966. National Historic Preservation Act

(16 USC §470 et seq.) 1966. National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC §4321) 1969. Coastal Zone Management Act (16 USC §1451) 1972. National Marine Sanctuaries Act (16 USC §1431) 1972. Archaeological and Historical Preservation Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1974. Federal Land Policy and Management Act (43 USC §35) 1976. American Indian Religious Freedom Act (42 USC §1996 and 1996a) 1978. Archaeological Resources Protection Act (16 USC §470aa-mm) 1979. Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 USC §3001-3013) 1990. Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (23 USC §101, 109) 1991. American Battlefield Protection Act (16 USC 469k) 1996. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

GEOLOGY & SOILS

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, California Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Special Publication 42, Interim Revision 2007. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Special Publication 117, Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California, 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances Title 6, Division 8, Chapter 3, Septic Tanks and Seepage Pits. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health, Land and Water Quality Division, February 2002. On-site Wastewater Systems (Septic Systems): Permitting Process and Design Criteria. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Natural Resource Inventory, Section 3, Geology.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. (soils.usda.gov)

HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

American Planning Association, Zoning News, "Saving Homes from Wildfires: Regulating the Home Ignition Zone," May 2001.

California Building Code (CBC), Seismic Requirements, Chapter 16 Section 162. (www.buildersbook.com)

California Education Code, Section 17215 and 81033. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Government Code. § 8585-8589, Emergency Services Act. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. April 1998. (www.dtsc.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code Chapter 6.95 and §25117 and §25316. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code § 2000-2067. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §17922.2. Hazardous Buildings. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Resources Agency, "OES Dam Failure Inundation Mapping and Emergency Procedures Program", 1996. (ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Consolidated Fire Code Health and Safety Code §13869.7, including Ordinances of the 17 Fire Protection Districts as Ratified by the San Diego County Board of Supervisors, First Edition, October 17, 2001 and Amendments to the Fire Code portion of the State Building Standards Code, 1998 Edition.

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health Community Health Division Vector Surveillance and Control. Annual Report for Calendar Year 2002. March 2003. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. California Accidental Release Prevention Program (CalARP) Guidelines. (<http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov>, www.oes.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. Hazardous Materials Business Plan Guidelines. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 5, CH. 3, Section 35.39100.030, Wildland/Urban Interface Ordinance, Ord. No.9111, 2000. (www.amlegal.com)

Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act as amended October 30, 2000, US Code, Title 42, Chapter 68, 5121, et seq. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Emergency Plan, March 2000.

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Energy Shortage Response Plan, June 1995.

Uniform Building Code. (www.buildersbook.com)

Uniform Fire Code 1997 edition published by the Western Fire Chiefs Association and the International Conference of Building Officials, and the National Fire Protection Association Standards 13 & 13-D, 1996 Edition, and 13-R, 1996 Edition. (www.buildersbook.com)

HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

American Planning Association, Planning Advisory Service Report Number 476 Non-point Source Pollution: A Handbook for Local Government

California Department of Water Resources, California Water Plan Update. Sacramento: Dept. of Water Resources State of California. 1998. (rubicon.water.ca.gov)

California Department of Water Resources, California's Groundwater Update 2003 Bulletin 118, April 2003. (www.groundwater.water.ca.gov)

California Department of Water Resources, Water Facts, No. 8, August 2000. (www.dpla2.water.ca.gov)

California Disaster Assistance Act. Government Code, § 8680-8692. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California State Water Resources Control Board, NPDES General Permit Nos. CAS000001 INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITIES (97-03-DWQ) and CAS000002 Construction Activities (No. 99-08-DWQ) (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

California Storm Water Quality Association, California Storm Water Best Management Practice Handbooks, 2003.

California Water Code, Sections 10754, 13282, and 60000 et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 7, Water Quality Control Plan. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Regulatory Ordinance, Title 8, Division 7, Grading Ordinance. Grading, Clearing and Watercourses. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Groundwater Ordinance. #7994. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov, <http://www.amlegal.com>.)

County of San Diego, Project Clean Water Strategic Plan, 2002. (www.projectcleanwater.org)

County of San Diego, Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance, Ordinance Nos. 9424 and 9426. Chapter 8, Division 7, Title 6 of the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances and amendments. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego. Board of Supervisors Policy I-68. Diego Proposed Projects in Flood Plains with Defined Floodways. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act), 1972, Title 33, Ch.26, Sub-Ch.1. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

Freeze, Allan and Cherry, John A., Groundwater, Prentice-Hall, Inc. New Jersey, 1979.

Heath, Ralph C., Basic Ground-Water Hydrology, United States Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper; 2220, 1991.

National Flood Insurance Act of 1968. (www.fema.gov)

National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994. (www.fema.gov)

Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, California Water Code Division 7. Water Quality. (ceres.ca.gov)

San Diego Association of Governments, Water Quality Element, Regional Growth Management Strategy, 1997. (www.sandag.org)

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, NPDES Permit No. CAS0108758. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

LAND USE & PLANNING

California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology, Open File Report 96-04, Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego County Production Consumption Region, 1996. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA Guidelines, 2003. (ceres.ca.gov)

California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code 21000-21178; California Code of Regulations, Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA, Appendix G, Title 14, Chapter 3, §15000-15387. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California General Plan Glossary of Terms, 2001. (ceres.ca.gov)

California State Mining and Geology Board, SP 51, California Surface Mining and Reclamation Policies and Procedures, January 2000. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-84: Project Facility. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-38, as amended 1989. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, General Plan as adopted and amended from September 29, 1971 to April 5, 2000. (ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego. Resource Protection Ordinance, compilation of Ord.Nos. 7968, 7739, 7685 and 7631. 1991.

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County.

Guide to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) by Michael H. Remy, Tina A. Thomas, James G. Moore, and Whitman F. Manley, Point Arena, CA: Solano Press Books, 1999. (ceres.ca.gov)

MINERAL RESOURCES

National Environmental Policy Act, Title 42, 36.401 et. seq. 1969. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

Subdivision Map Act, 2003. (ceres.ca.gov)

U.S. Geologic Survey, Causey, J. Douglas, 1998, MAS/MILS Mineral Location Database.

U.S. Geologic Survey, Frank, David G., 1999, (MRDS) Mineral Resource Data System.

NOISE

California State Building Code, Part 2, Title 24, CCR, Appendix Chapter 3, Sound Transmission Control, 1988. . (www.buildersbook.com)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 6, Chapter 4, Noise Abatement and Control, effective February 4, 1982. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego General Plan, Part VIII, Noise Element, effective December 17, 1980. (ceres.ca.gov)

Federal Aviation Administration, Federal Aviation Regulations, Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Planning (revised January 18, 1985). (<http://www.access.gpo.gov/>)

Harris Miller Miller and Hanson Inc., *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*, April 1995. (<http://ntl.bts.gov/data/rail05/rail05.html>)

International Standard Organization (ISO), ISO 362; ISO 1996 1-3; ISO 3095; and ISO 3740-3747. (www.iso.ch)

U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Office of Environment and Planning, Noise and Air Quality Branch. "Highway Traffic Noise Analysis and Abatement Policy and Guidance," Washington, D.C., June 1995. (<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/>)

POPULATION & HOUSING

Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, 42 USC 5309, Title 42--The Public Health And Welfare, Chapter 69--Community Development, United States Congress, August 22, 1974. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

National Housing Act (Cranston-Gonzales), Title 12, Ch. 13. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

San Diego Association of Governments Population and Housing Estimates, November 2000. (www.sandag.org)

U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000. (<http://www.census.gov/>)

RECREATION

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 8, Division 10, Chapter PLDO, §810.101 et seq. Park Lands Dedication Ordinance. (www.amlegal.com)

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

California Aeronautics Act, Public Utilities Code, Section 21001 et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics, California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook, January 2002.

California Department of Transportation, Environmental Program Environmental Engineering – Noise, Air Quality, and Hazardous Waste Management Office. "Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol for New Highway Construction and Reconstruction Projects," October 1998. (www.dot.ca.gov)

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Street and Highways Code. California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Alternative Fee Schedules with Pass-By Trips Addendum to Transportation Impact Fee Reports, March 2005. (<http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/dpw/land/pdf/TransImpactFee/attach.pdf>)

County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Report. January 2005. (<http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/dpw/permits-forms/manuals.html>)

Fallbrook & Ramona Transportation Impact Fee Report, County of San Diego, January 2005. (<http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/dpw/permits-forms/manuals.html>)

Office of Planning, Federal Transit Administration, Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, Final Report, April 1995.

San Diego Association of Governments, 2020 Regional Transportation Plan. Prepared by the San Diego Association of Governments. (www.sandag.org)

U.S. Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77. (www.gpoaccess.gov)

UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS

California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14. Natural Resources Division, CIWMB Division 7; and Title 27, Environmental Protection Division 2, Solid Waste. (ccr.oal.ca.gov)

California Integrated Waste Management Act. Public Resources Code, Division 30, Waste Management, Sections 40000-41956. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-78: Small Wastewater. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization
Annex T Emergency Water Contingencies, October 1992.
(www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000.

U.S. Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation
Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace,
Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource
Conservation Service LESA System.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San
Diego Area, California. 1973.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land
Management (BLM) modified Visual Management
System.

U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway
Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for
Highway Projects.